

10/695,069

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 08 2008

- 7 -

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this Application, of which claims 1, 12, and 23 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11-16, 18, 19, and 21-23 are being amended to further clarify the scope of the claims and to correct obvious drafting errors. Support for these amendments is found at least on page 15, line 2 – page 16, line 10; page 18, line 9 – page 20, line 21 and Figs. 14 and 15 of the Specification as originally filed. The remarks below in connection with claim rejections refer to the claims as amended herein.

Applicants thank Examiner for the indication that claims 4, 6, 9-11, 15, 17 and 20-22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, those claims have not been rewritten because it is believed the base claims from which they depend are also allowable.

Claim 24 is being cancelled in order to expedite allowance of the remaining claims. Applicants reserve the right to present the cancelled claim in a continuing application depending from this Application. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, it is asserted that, in claims 1, 12 and 23, the limitation “the clock signal” has insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 1, 12 and 23 are being amended to delete the limitation “the clock signal.” Thus, the § 112 rejection of claims 1, 12 and 23 is believed to be overcome; reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 12-14, 16, 19 and 23 have been rejected under one of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) as being anticipated or unpatentable over Huffman (U.S. Patent No. 4,387,459). Claims 7 and 18 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Huffman in view of Chang (U.S. Patent no. 6,628,605). Applicants respectfully submit that Huffman does not anticipate any of

10/695,069

- 8 -

the pending claims, and that Huffman and Chang, taken individually or in combination, do not render any of the pending claims obvious.

Claims 1, 12 and 23 are being amended to further clarify the scope of the invention, and now recite, in the same or similar language, "a timing signal generator to generate a second timing signal in response to the first timing signal, wherein the second timing signal exhibits one pulse for every N pulses of the first timing signal, N being an integer value," as well as "wherein a maximum timing error of the second timing signal tolerable by the lower frequency demultiplexer substantially exceeds a maximum timing error of the first timing signal tolerable by the higher frequency demultiplexer."

Huffman describes a high-speed demux (40) coupled via elastic buffers (42, 44, 46, 48) to low-speed demultiplexers (22a, 24a, 26a, 28a), but fails to teach or suggest "a timing signal generator to generate a second timing signal in response to the first timing signal, wherein the second timing signal exhibits one pulse for every N pulses of the first timing signal, N being an integer value." Instead, Huffman describes a scheme in which pulses in channel clocks (clocks that accompany the channels between the high-speed demux and low-speed demuxes) are occasionally suppressed as necessary to compensate for differences between timing domains in the high-speed and low-speed demultiplexers. Consequently, as shown in Fig. 4 of Huffman, when a channel clock pulse is suppressed (i.e., 193), there is no channel clock pulse for the corresponding pulses of the high-speed clock. Thus, even assuming arguendo that the high-speed clock (115) and channel clock (51) of Huffman correspond to the first and second timing signals of claim 1, Huffman still fails to disclose that the channel clock exhibits "one pulse for every N pulses" of the high-speed clock signal. In view of this clear distinction, at least, Huffman does not anticipate or render obvious claim 1 or dependent claims 2-5 and 7-11. Also, for at least the foregoing reasons, Huffman does not anticipate claims 12-14, 16, 18, 19 or 23, nor render any of those claims obvious.

With respect to the section 103 rejections in view of Huffman and Chang, applicants note that Chang merely teaches the use of a delay locked loop circuit, and so that, even if Huffman and Chang could be combined in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the combination would still lack at least the foregoing limitation and thus would not have rendered any of the pending claims obvious.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

10/695,069


JUL 08 2008
-9-

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Benjamin J. Sparrow
Registration No. 62,259
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 7/8/08